

Mr. SCHEUER. Have any of you gentlemen read the three recent reports of the National Advisory Council for title I?

When Congress passed the title I program for ESEA in 1965, we set up a National Advisory Council to report back. They have issued three remarkably interesting reports. I would urge you to study them. They have some great lessons and the chief among these lessons is that the public school system, as an institution, has done far less than it should and, hopefully, will, in applying the lessons we have learned from title I and in changing its way of doing business.

The programs have been scattered and fragmentary. The public school system as an institution has been very reluctant nationally to reach out to parents. I am sure many cities have done an excellent job, but as an actual institution the public school system has not reached out to parents and has not provided health care and nutrition; some have used virtually all of their title I funds in feeding and clothing children.

The Advisory Council reports are shocking and appalling. No member of this committee would deny a child coming to school for food and nutrition and if that can only come out of title I funds, I am sure we would say something about it but that was not the purpose of title I funds, to feed and clothe kids. This is a local welfare responsibility.

The same thing would go for the comprehensive social services that are so necessary. The same problem was found in the imaginative and creative use of school aides. It was found that school systems were apathetic to varying degrees and were hostile to the use of school aides to help fill a desperate need for staff.

Now, you folks want us to turn total control of these programs over to the state agencies; you want Headstart to go to OE; you want title III to be under the total control of the State agencies.

Frankly, I would like to see the day when the State and local agencies, education agencies, can handle these funds creatively and constructively.

What I would like to know from you is how can we engender some consciousness at the State and local levels that basic change in our educational system is indicated and that some of the lessons we have learned in Headstart ought to be applied?

I think it is shocking that not a single State legislature has received the germ of an idea from Headstart, and that preentry education is not healthy and constructive. Not a single State has instituted a state-wide kindergarten program as the result of the Headstart program.

What do you think the Congress and the National Association of School Administrators can do to engender some consciousness of the need for change, create some momentum for change in the public school system—actually, the kind of momentum that the Headstart program now provides?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Could I make a comment on that?

It is pretty hard to identify what causes what. Going back to your comments and the comments that were made previously, the State of Indiana passed a kindergarten support bill in February of 1965. That was just preceding Headstart. I don't know whether they are connected or not, but I know that our State and in our area there is a